

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: In (k) “stoke” should be “stroke.” The “and” should be deleted after the limitation, “providing a program for....” Instead, the “and” should be placed after the limitation, “maintaining a database of user...” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. The terms AR, AP, Rec, Pay, TT, and JJ in line 15 of claim 1 are acronyms that are not described fully, and therefore render the claims indefinite. The Examiner suggests spelling out each acronym for clarity.

5. The limitation “performing or capturing transactions data of credit sale” in line 16 of page 1 is indefinite, as it does not clarify which action it is performing.

6. In claims 1, 2, 4, and 5, these claims contain limitations, which are labeled with quotation marks or parenthesis or both. “subject (S)” in line 28, “Object (O)” in line 29, “exchange difference calculation” in lines 22-23 of page 2, and “principal of translation of foreign currency transaction” in line 24 of page 2, “(S) plus (O) together with (E), if

exchange difference derived" in lines 33-34 of page 2 are examples, as this is prevalent throughout the claims. It is not clear whether these limitations are part of the claimed invention and therefore render the claims indefinite.

7. The terms "general accounting practice", "general-purpose computer", "appropriate exchange rates", "standard processing procedural steps", and "precise user file" in claims 1, 2, and 8 are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. The terms are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

8. In claim 1, the claim discusses "special purpose", however, what is being addressed and how this addressing is done is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

9. In claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "each working page" in lines 20, 34 of page 1 and lines 23, 33 of page 2, "the working pages" in lines 24 and 28, "the features" in line 27, "the debit" in line 31, "the credit field" in line 31, "each record" in line 32, "the rules" in line 33 of page 1 and line 5 of page 2, "the same set" in line 34, "the transaction record set" in line 1 of page 2, "the Total-Debit-Equal-Total-Credit rule" in lines 4 and 19-20 of page 2, "the record-sets group" in lines 1, 2, and 11 of page 2, "the record-set" in lines 5 and 28 of page 2, "the JJ page" in line 10 of page 2, "the next set transaction data" of line 11 of page 2, "the same transactions" of lines 12 and 16 of page 2, "the program" in lines 12, 18 of page 2 and

lines 1, 18 of page 3, "the function" in lines 13 and 22 of page 2, "the transmission of" in line 15 of page 2, "the same transactions" in line 16 of page 2, "the total debit" in line 16 of page 2, "the total credit" in line 17 of page 2, "the (S)" in line 17 of page 2, "the appropriate exchange rates" in lines 21-22 of page 2, "the application" in line 22 of page 2, "the "principal of.."" in lines 23-24 of page 2, "the adoption" of lines 26-27 of page 2, "the debit" of line 28 of page 2, "the adverse" in line 29 of page 2, "the amount" in line 31 of page 2, "the full procedural steps" in line 32 of page 2, "the Debit-Equal-Credit test" of line 32 of page 2, "the data set" in line 2 of page 3, "the double entry journal" in line 3 of page 3, "each separate process" in line 4 of page 3, "the voucher" in line 6 of page 3, "the identification fields" in lines 10 and 17 of page 3, "the converted amount" in line 11 of page 3, "the records sets" in line 14 of page 3, "the designated database file" in line 15 of page 3, "each processing" in lines 15-16 of page 3, "the user's" in lines 17, 21 of page 3, "the limitations" in line 18 of page 3, "the usage" in line 18 of page 3, "the reporting command" in line 20 of page 3, "the plurality of journal records" in line 22 of page 3, "the user" in line 23 of page 3, "the general-purpose computer browser" in lines 24-25 of page 3.

10. In claim 2, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the six working pages" in line 27 of page 2, "the transaction type" in line 28 of page 2, and "the summation" in lines 31, 32 of page 2.

11. In claim 4, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the principle" in lines 6-7 of page 4, "the amount" in lines 9, 10 of page 4, and "the record-sets group" in line 11 of page 4.

12. In claim 5, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the database file" in lines 16-17 of page 4, "the record-sets group" in line 8 of page 5, and "the journal" in line 8 of page 5.

13. In claim 6, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the opening balance" in lines 15-16 of page 5, "the accounts receivable" in line 16 of page 5, "each balance sheet item" in line 17 of page 5, "each business unit" in line 18 of page 5, "each of particular business units" in lines 19-20 of page 5, and "each record" in line 21 of page 5.

14. In claim 7, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the six working pages" in line 23 of page 5, "the desired icon" in line 24 of page 5, "the functions bar" in line 25 of page 6, and "the abbreviation form" in line 26 of page 5.

15. In claim 8, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the precise user file" in line 29 of page 5, and "the user's identity" in line 30 of page 5.

16. In claim 9, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the rights of access" in line 32 of page 5, "the right to access" in line 1 of page 6, "the head office" in lines 2, 4 of page 6, "the authority" in line 3 of page 6, "the financial information" in line 3 of page 6, "the right to define" in line 4 of page 6, "each user" in line 5 of page 6, "each business unit" in lines 6, 7 of page 6, "the right to handle" in line 7 of page 6, "the accounts" in lines 7-8 of page 6, "the business unit" in line 8 of page 6, and "the limitations" in line 8 of page 6.

17. In claim 10, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the work platform" in line 12 of page 6, "the details" in line 14 of page 6, "the guiding

instructions/wordings" in line 15 of page 6, "each page" in line 16 of page 6, and "the program" in line 16 of page 7.

18. In claim 11, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the report editor" in lines 19-20 of page 6, "the browser" in line 20 of page 6, and "the assistant" in line 21 of page 6.

19. In claim 12, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitation: "the accounts code" in lines 23-24 of page 6.

20. In claim 14, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the program" in line 30 of page 6, and "the user's database file" in line 2 of page 7.

21. In claim 15, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the following limitations: "the command" in line 6 of page 7, "the database file" in lines 7-8 of page 7, "the information" in line 8 of page 7, "the selected test type" of lines 8-9 of page 7, "the general-purpose computer" of line 9 of page 7, "the report editor" in line 10 of page 7, and "the program" of line 10 of page 7.

The Examiner respectfully requests that the Applicant carefully review the claims for other 112 issues not cited above in order to better clarify the Applicant's invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

22. Claims 1-15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fawaad Haider whose telephone number is 571-272-7178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627

/Fawaad Haider/
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

FIH